

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

CHARLES RANDOLPH,	)	3:13-cv-00148-RCJ-WGC
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	<b><u>MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS</u></b>
	)	
vs.	)	
	)	August 13, 2013
THE STATE OF NEVADA, ex rel,	)	
NEVADA DEPARTMENT OF	)	
CORRECTION, <i>et al.</i> ,	)	
Defendants.	)	
_____	)	

PRESENT: THE HONORABLE WILLIAM G. COBB, U.S. MAGISTRATE JUDGE

DEPUTY CLERK: Katie Lynn Ogden REPORTER: FTR

COUNSEL FOR PLAINTIFF: Charles Randolph, In Pro Per (Telephonically)

COUNSEL FOR DEFENDANT(S): Matthew Addison and Mark Iba (Telephonically) obo:  
Embarq Payphone Services, Inc and Kelly Werth (Telephonically) obo: State Defendants

**MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS: STATUS CONFERENCE**

1:37 p.m. Court convenes.

**I. Plaintiff's Motion for Extension of Time (Dkt. #11)**

The Court first addresses Plaintiff's Motion for Extension of Time (Dkt. #11). The Court Docket reflects that Mr. Randolph filed his Response to Defendants' Motion to Dismiss (Dkt. #5) on April 22, 2013 (Dkt. #14). Therefore, Plaintiff's Motion for Extension of Time (Dkt. #11) is **DENIED** as moot.

Thereafter, the Court finds that Defendants' Motion for Enlargement of Time (Dkt. #16), filed May 1, 2013, shall also be **DENIED** as moot.

**II. Proposed Discovery Plan/Scheduling Order (Dkt. #34)**

The Court turns to the Proposed Discovery Plan/Scheduling Order (Dkt. #34). The Court notes that this case is somewhat unique compared to other 42 U.S.C. § 1983 cases, in that an additional Defendant is named in the complaint who is not a State entity (i.e. Defendant Embarq Payphone Services, Inc). In light of this, the Court contemplates whether a standard scheduling order should be issued by the Court, whether a stay of discovery should be entered until after the

By: \_\_\_\_\_ /s/  
Katie Lynn Ogden, Deputy Clerk